DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 691 SO 014 708

AUTHOR Grove, Cornelius Lee; Hansel, Bettina
TITLE Two Doctoral Dissertations concerning the International Exchange of Secondary Students: Reviews and Critiques. AFS Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning, No. 2.
INSTITUTION AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 18p.
AVAILABLE FROM AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc., 313 East 43rd Street, New York, NY 10017 (free).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adjustment (to Environment); Case Studies; *Culture Conflict; Doctoral Dissertations; Educational Research; High School Students; *International Educational Exchange; Literature Reviews; Research Problems; Secondary Education; *Student Exchange Programs; Study Abroad; *Success
IDENTIFIERS *Host Nation Programs

ABSTRACT

Two doctoral dissertations (one a case study and the other, quantitative research) which examine the experience of secondary school international exchange students are reviewed. The first, "Case Study of a Latin American Sojourner: Crossing Hard Times," by Nancy B. King (Wayne State University, 1981) documents the difficult relationship of a Brazilian student with an unprepared and sometimes hostile host family in the United States and with an unprepared advisor. As a result of his negative experiences, the student became depressed, angry, and manipulative. Making placement arrangements well in advance and requiring sponsors to contact students and host families periodically could have averted this unfortunate situation. The second dissertation, "Defining and Predicting Overseas Effectiveness for Adolescent Exchange Students," by Robbins S. Hopkins (University of Massachusetts, 1982) sampled 209 exchange students and their host families. Prior to their experiences, students were given the Loevinger Sentence Completion Test (LSCT) as a measure of personality development. Post-experience questionnaires were administered to students, families, and exchange personnel. Problems with the study concern the inability to explain differences between successful and unsuccessful exchange students by the multiple regression model. The major contribution is the introduction of the LSCT as a possible predictor of overseas success. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231691

NO. 2

Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning

NOVEMBER 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cornelius Lee Grove

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Two Doctoral Dissertations Concerning the International Exchange of Secondary Students: Reviews and Critiques

by: Cornelius Lee Grove
and Bettina Hansel

ED 214 708

A Publication of AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE OF AFS INTERNATIONAL

AFS volunteers and professional staff throughout the world are moving towards the goal of peace by stimulating an awareness of mankind's common humanity, a wider understanding of the diverse cultures of the world, and a concern for the global issues confronting society. They acknowledge that peace is a dynamic concept threatened by injustices both between and within nations.

In pursuit of this goal, the core of the AFS experience has been the promotion of relationships in which families, communities, groups and maturing young persons from different cultural backgrounds share new learning situations related to the purposes of AFS. In addition, through experience and experimentation, AFS has developed and continues to encourage new models and opportunities for exchange that will be beneficial for the development of society.

AFS does not affiliate with any religious, political or partisan group, but it believes in the value of participating in a continuous process of interaction between cultures both across and within boundaries.

AFS encourages all participants to involve themselves in situations in which they can apply and project their AFS experience.

INTRODUCTION

Many people have requested to be added to the mailing list for the *Occasional Papers*; in fact, the number of requests has exceeded our initial expectations by more than 200. We are pleased to be able to share our "open forum" with so many interested people, and we look forward to seeing our address list continue to grow. Some recipients have sent us comments about the first number of the *Papers*. We encourage this and hope that we will continue to provide many readers with food for thought and discussion.

Some readers are receiving the *Occasional Papers* without having asked to be added to the mailing list. If you do not wish to continue to receive this publication, send us a postcard to that effect and we will remove your name from the mailing list at once.

In this second number of *OPIL*, we are featuring the two reviews previously announced for the first number. Within the past year, two doctoral dissertations have been completed that examine factors directly related to the international exchange of secondary students. One, by Nancy B. King, traces the "hard times" of a 16-year-old Brazilian who sojourned with host families in the U.S. for six months. The other, by Robbins S. Hopkins, explores possible definitions of sojourner success and the criteria that might be used to select young people for an extended intercultural homestay. These two dissertations are reviewed in this number by Cornelius Lee Grove and Bettina Hansel of the AFS Research Department.

If you would like to purchase a copy of either dissertation, here is all the information you need to do so. Doctoral dissertations are published on demand by University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, USA. When ordering, always mention the University Microfilms order number as well as the author and title of the dissertation. When a dissertation is mailed to an address anywhere in the United States, the total cost is $32.25; when mailed anywhere in Europe, the total cost is $39.20 U.S. When mailed anywhere other than the U.S. or Europe, a dissertation costs $36.70 U.S. (surface mail) or $44.00 U.S. (air mail). Make checks payable to University Microfilms International.

CASE STUDY OF A LATIN AMERICAN SOJOURNER: CROSSING HARD TIMES

Nancy B. King

Ph.D. dissertation completed at Wayne State University (Detroit, Michigan), 1981. 253 pages. University Microfilms order no. 81-17076.

"João Barros da Silva" is the pseudonym of a 16-year-old Brazilian boy who is the subject of this compelling, sometimes shocking, doctoral dissertation by Nancy B. King. *Compelling* and *shocking* are terms that rarely are used to describe sober academic treatises. In this instance they apply admirably. For King's carefully researched work is a case study, a story, a dramatic tragedy over and above anything else it may be. It makes for fascinating reading at the same time that it informs us about many of the things that can go wrong, horribly wrong, when secondary-school students participate in international exchange programs.

Stripped to its essential elements, the story of João Barros da Silva is as follows.

João was raised in a provincial city located in the central west of Brazil, the son of well-to-do and socially prominent professional parents who could have afforded with ease to pay for an exchange experience. But João was required to work and save money over a period of several years to help finance his sojourn, which was viewed by his parents as a sort of rite of passage designed to help João become "cultured," in the narrow sense of the term. João's proficiency in English was low (a 1+ rating on a scale of 1 to 5). He attended the pre-departure orientation sessions (in Brazil) provided by the sponsoring exchange organization, where his highly unrealistic expectations were left unshaken by an intellectualized introduction to the phenomenon of culture shock. He also attended an orientation session offered by the sponsoring organization several weeks after his arrival in the U.S.

The first problem that awaited João in the U.S. was one whose ramifications he was never able to escape. His American host family had been decided upon only three days in advance of his arrival. That this family, the "Sherwoods," could not participate in an orientation session is beside the point; they had a basic knowledge of international exchange because two of their children had been exchange

Continued on page 9.

exchange students. The point is that the Sherwoods were "selected" in a wholly unsatisfactory manner. Mr. Sherwood describes the events that led up to their receiving João:

> My wife and I didn't ask to be host parents. Three days before John was to arrive in the U.S., we got a call from the organization saying they had this Brazilian student and no home, and would we take him. We felt sorry for the boy and said yes. We didn't think it would be right for a student to come here and not have a home. They gave us a little information about him, mostly his medical history and his parents' name. . . . No one came to the house to discuss this placement with us. It was like they called, then John was here. We weren't really told anything. They just called, begged us to take him, and he was here at the airport. That was it. (p. 99)

King devotes some 50 pages to describing and analyzing João's experiences during the ten weeks he remained with Mr. and Mrs. Sherwood. It's a story of rarely mitigated disaster -- of mental and social isolation as well as repeated attacks of acute anxiety on João's part, and of insensitivity and fault-finding on the Sherwood's. One of the worst indignities João had to endure on a number of occasions was being left in the house alone all day due to the fact that Mr. and Mrs. Sherwood both worked. ("When we're not here," said Mrs. Sherwood to João, "you can't have company over.") When they came home in the evening, they typically had little to say to João or to each other. King focuses her attention on the personal reactions of João to his depressing circumstances, and on his increasingly desperate struggle to cope and to find sources of support. The response of the local representative of the sponsoring organization, "Mr. Ward," to João's urgent appeals is appalling. Apparently, Mr. Ward could not conceive of the possibility that anything might be wrong with the Sherwoods. On the strength of one observation of João helping the Sherwoods with the dishes, Mr. Ward concluded that "In no way, shape, or form can John honestly feel he's not a member of this family." Thereupon, he immediately diagnosed João as having "just a case of severe homesickness." His preferred method of dealing with this malady was to angrily advise João to keep his mind occupied, and to purposefully remain indifferent to all expressions of sadness. On one occasion, when João telephoned Mr. Ward from the corner store to avoid being overheard by the Sherwoods, Mr. Ward telephoned the Sherwoods and shared João's confidences before João returned home.

A source of support that João was able to use temporarily was a popular and warm-hearted American girl at his high school, but her help evaporated suddenly when the extent of João's dependence on her became evident. João received more sustained comfort and encouragement from his circle of Brazilian exchange students in the vicinity, and particularly from a Brazilian girl who seemed perceptive and compassionate beyond her years.

In spite of his fears that the Sherwoods might react violently, and his uncertainty due to Mr. Ward's blame-the-victim strategy, João finally gained sufficient confidence in his own interpretation of events -- and sufficient raw courage -- to demand a change of host families. Backing up his demand with a threat to telephone the main office of the sponsoring organization, João eventually got his way, but not before he was forced to endure five awful days with the Sherwoods between the time he made his request and the time he and his baggage were finally driven away.

After ten days with a temporary family, João was placed with the "Framptons," a family with a 7-year-old son who were field representatives of the sponsoring organization and who had previous experience as hosts. The Framptons adored João and showered him with attention; his reaction to them was ecstatic. The first week João spent in the Frampton household was probably the longest period of sustained happiness that he experienced during his entire sojourn experience. He also was feeling for the first time a sense of resolution and success in that he had put behind him the worst that culture shock had to offer. But all was not well. João was sensing a greater and greater communications gap between himself and his *natural* family, whose questions to him had been superficial in the extreme and whose advice had been naive. In addition, João was troubled by feelings of intense hatred for the Sherwoods and Mr. Ward, and of persistent distrust for the sponsoring organization. For all their apparent good qualities, the Framptons compounded João's new set of difficulties by discouraging his spontaneous outbursts of anger and resentment, thereby preventing him from dealing with his feelings or resolving his internal conflicts.

One can forgive the Framptons for this; after all, they wanted concrete evidence that João was positively enjoying the portion of his sojourn that was occurring under their roof. One finds it harder to forgive the sponsoring organization, however, for the circumstances in which the Framptons found themselves a few weeks after João arrived. First, a second 16-year-old Brazilian boy, "Antonio," came to live with the Framptons because no host family had existed for him when he arrived in the U.S. and none had been found in the intervening three months. João and Antonio were polar opposites in personality, and soon were at each other's throats. Next, the Framptons were asked by the sponsoring organization to assume additional responsibilities as volunteers; they accepted, with the results that their lives became a frenzy of non-stop activity, and that they became deeply involved in acrimonious political infighting over territorial divisions and personnel assignments. In addition, the Framptons became responsible for supervising the adjustment of some 20 foreign students living in their area; in a number of cases, these students lived with the Framptons temporarily while new hosts were being sought, and three of these students (*in addition* to Antonio and João) eventually remained in the Frampton home until the end of their sojourn. Mrs. Frampton herself pronounced her home a "madhouse." As for João, he began to suffer from sleep

disturbances, entered a period of depression and social withdrawal, and gained 25 pounds (11 kg.) over a period of nine weeks.

In mid-June, João attended a pre-departure workshop provided by the sponsoring organization. His spirits soared as he contemplated being re-united with his Brazilian parents, and he began buying gifts for all the members of his natural family. But his euphoria didn't last. The pre-departure workshop had stressed that "reverse culture shock" may be awaiting the students upon their return home, and João became terrified at the prospect of attempting to cope with isolation and acute anxiety a second time. Plagued by ambivalent feelings and dozens of unanswered questions, and fearful of causing embarrassment to his parents and friends upon returning to Brazil, João had a falling out with the Framptons' 7-year-old son and went out of his way to discredit Antonio behind his back. But through it all, he maintained a strong attitude of gratitude and love toward Mr. and Mrs. Frampton.

João's account of his experiences upon returning to Brazil suggest that he did indeed pass through a period of intense reverse culture shock. What is especially interesting about his readjustment difficulties is that he steadfastly maintained that he had never become Americanized, that he had never changed from being a Brazilian with Brazilian ways who happened to be sojourning in the United States. But within four months of returning, he was getting back into the swing of Brazilian life. João's final thoughts on his intercultural experience were these:

> All the time I was in the dark hole at the Sherwoods I was fighting with myself. When I took the decision to move, I began to grow. This is what I learned in the United States: When a man begins to fight with his own self, he begins to grow. (p. 175)

* * * * * * *

I began by recounting the essential elements of João's story not only because that story is the central feature of King's dissertation, but also because the other features of her dissertation cannot be understood outside the context of João's story. Now that the story has been told, I will go on to comment on some of those other features and to consider what we can learn from João's experiences.

One thing I learned, or reaffirmed, as a consequence of reading João's story concerns the vital importance of the *Criteria for Teenager Exchange Visitor Programs* published by the U.S. International Communication Agency. There is no need for me to explain how João's experience might have been different had the following guidelines been observed by the organization that sponsored João's sojourn in the United States:

8.1 A program sponsor's representative must personally interview and visit the home of each host family before that family is

permitted to receive an exchange visitor. Telephone interviews are not sufficient.

8.3 The American host family should have at home during non-school hours at least one family member, preferably a teenager, to assure the exchange student of some companionship.

8.4 [Placement] arrangements should be made well in advance so that the students and their hosts have ample time for correspondence before the students leave their home countries.

8.7 Home placement *must* be made before the student's arrival in the United States.

9.2 Sponsors must contact students and their host families periodically throughout their exchange visit to ensure that problems are dealt with promptly and effectively. These periodic contacts should include personal meetings with students.

In addition, I found instructive João's encounters with Mr. Ward. King provides no information about Mr. Ward's background, training (if any), or motivation for being involved as a local volunteer representative for the sponsoring organization; we are left to imagine the worst. Whatever may be true about Mr. Ward, however, there is abundant evidence that he was unprepared by temperament or training to carry out his assigned functions. All student exchange organizations must continually grapple with the problems involved in recruiting suitable volunteers, providing them with training, and monitoring their performance. That a Mr. Ward could be a local volunteer representative is by no means a proof that the sponsoring organization in this case failed to be concerned about the quality of its volunteers. On the other hand, Mr. Ward's case reminds all of us in this business that our volunteers, as our "front-line troops," are extremely vital to our effectiveness in terms of dealing with both the public and our program participants. Perhaps the selection and training of volunteer representatives deserves even more care and thought than we've been able to give it in the past.

A third instructive feature of João's experience arises out of the question I found myself asking again and again as I read the 50 pages that describe his sojourn with the Sherwood family: *What makes João survive?* Considering the provocations he endured, it is remarkable that João remained with the Sherwoods for *ten* weeks, and that he emerged from this ordeal in reasonably sound psychological condition. And I think I have an answer, at least a partial answer, to my question. Each week, João spent one hour pouring out his feelings and frustrations to the author of this dissertation, Nancy King. *Fundamentally, King did nothing but listen.* She was neutral and non-judgmental, offered no information or advice, provided no solace or intervention. She avoided the roles of therapist, advisor, and advocate, and concentrated solely on finding out from João as much as possible about his

opinions, impressions, reactions, and emotions. In short, King limited herself to trying to understand João from João's point of view. And yet, here is what João has to say about the experience of being King's research subject:

> Talking with you is good for me: I'm meeting more of myself. It's strange talking with you. It's like I talk and listen and think about what I'm saying. Then I know myself better. When I know more about me, I am able to answer the problems more quickly. I think the same learning would come for me in time without your help, but it's good with you because I'm growing. By showing respect for my inside life you have taught me to give respect t, my wants and feelings. (pp. 65-66).

In closing, I want to offer some brief comments about this dissertation that will be of interest primarily to others who are engaged in research or theory-building in the field of secondary-student exchange.

First, I wish to remind the reader that King's dissertation is a case study, an approach to the understanding of human experience that is as rich in potential as it is neglected in practice. Besides providing in her own procedures a model of careful case-study methodology, King offers a spirited defense of the value of the case study approach in the opening pages of her work.

Second, almost wholly absent from this review has been mention or even acknowledgement of King's analyses, or diagnoses, of the psychological, interpersonal, and cross-cultural factors that underlay João's experiences as an exchange student. Mention of these in any detail would have lengthened this review beyond the capacity of these *Occasional Papers* to contain them. My hope is that many who read this review will be persuaded to purchase King's entire dissertation and to become acquainted with her analyses on a first-hand basis.

Finally, I want to note the one point where I dissent from King's otherwise fine work. Perhaps inevitably -- given that this is a dissertation -- King attempts to relate João's experience to the currently prevailing theory about the behavior of sojourners in a different culture. This theory lays out a series of sequential stages through which successful intercultural sojourners are thought to pass. These stages, listed here only by number and title, are as follows:

-- Culture Shock --

Stage I: Spectator
Stage II: Defensive Contact
Stage III: Recovery

-- Culture Learning --

Stage IV:	Establishing Bona Fide Contacts
Stage V:	Sorting Out Meaning
Stage VI:	Establishing a Role
Stage VII:	Knowledge of Self
Stage VIII:	Development of Needed Attributes and Skills
Stage IX:	Development of Meaningful Relationships

-- Post Sojourn --

Stage X:	Re-Entry

There are two problems from my point of view. One is that I found less than convincing King's attempts to apply the theory to João. I am uncertain whether the difficulties lie with the atypical nature of João's experience, or with an inadequacy of the theory itself, or with a weakness in King's analysis. In any case, King argues that João did not progress beyond Stage III (Recovery). While it is clear that João did not accomplish any significant amount of culture learning, I personally felt that in minor ways he may have taken some halting, tentative steps as far as Stage VII (Knowledge of Self). But I agree that he in no sense achieved Stage VII.

The second problem that I identified concerns the theory. It is insupportable, in my opinion, to leave as a single undivided unit Stage X (Re-Entry). I was a little surprised that King didn't take upon herself the task of differentiating Stage X. The literature in the field of re-entry (or reverse culture shock) would have permitted her to do this, and João's experience also provided her with ample reason to do so. Perhaps she felt that this was beyond the scope of her project.

My overall evaluation of *Case Study of a Latin American Sojourner: Crossing Hard Times* is that it is a carefully prepared document that is both intrinsically interesting and a valuable addition to our storehouse of practical and theoretical knowledge about intercultural homestays for secondary-school students.

reviewed by Cornelius Lee Grove

DEFINING AND PREDICTING OVERSEAS EFFECTIVENESS FOR ADOLESCENT EXCHANGE STUDENTS

Robbins S. Hopkins

Ed.D. dissertation completed at the University of Massachusetts (Amherst, Massachusetts), 1982. 292 pages. University Microfilms order no. 82-10334.

One of the major problems for virtually any international organization is selecting those individuals who will do well if sent to live and work in another culture. This problem is particularly critical for student exchange organizations, yet, until recently, little research had been done concerning the selection of students for overseas[1] study, and virtually no research had been conducted on selecting secondary students for the experience of living with a host family in another culture. Therefore this dissertation by Robbins Hopkins is most welcome for those of us who deal with secondary-level student exchange programs.

The Hopkins study is a pioneering attempt to identify some variables that may predict success overseas. Hopkins has succeeded in identifying some variables that seem to be related to successful overseas experiences, including the students' scores on the Loevinger Sentence Completion Test. However, much of the difference between students who do well overseas and those who do not cannot be explained by any of the variables that Hopkins identifies. Hopkins, then, does *not* present a model for predicting the success of students going abroad, but does present the results of a carefully designed piece of research that suggests some new directions for future research.

Defining and Predicting Overseas Effectiveness is a careful replication of a study of the adaptation and effectiveness of Canadian technical advisors and their families on overseas assignments, conducted by Frank Hawes and Daniel J. Kealey. The Hawes and Kealey study, sponsored by the Canadian International Development Agency, attempted to define overseas success and to create a profile of those individuals who do well on overseas assignments. Hopkins used the methodology of the CIDA study with only slight modifications in her study of secondary-school exchange students. The similarity between the CIDA study and Hopkins' research is important, as the results from these studies are easily compared with each other.

Hopkins studied a sample of 209 exchange students. The sample included Latin American students sojourning in the U.S. and students from the U.S. sojourning in Australia. The students were given, upon

their arrival in the host country, the Loevinger Sentence Completion Test as a measure of personality development. Then, toward the end of the experience, the students, host families, and local representatives of the exchange organization in the host country were sent questionnaires very similar to those used by Hawes and Kealey. These end-of-stay questionnaires were designed to obtain two types of data. Measures of personal characteristics and the individual's background were considered to be the independent, or "predictor" variables along with the LSCT results.[2] Measures of the student's success in the experience were seen as the dependent variables, or "criteria" data.

Besides studying a new population, Hopkins' research goals went beyond those stated by Hawes and Kealey. In the CIDA study, Hawes and Kealey collected data on the personal characteristics and background of the technical advisors and their spouses at the same time as they were collecting data on the overseas "success" of these same people. As such, the Hawes and Kealey study does not offer a proven means of selecting candidates for overseas assignment. Hopkins attempted partially to rectify this shortcoming by adding to the CIDA method a potentially predictive instrument, the Loevinger Sentence Completion Test. The LSCT is a widely used test of psychological development, and was administered to the students before their actual experience so that the usefulness of this test as a selection tool could be determined. Unfortunately, Hopkins was not able to test the predictive value of the Hawes and Kealey questionnaire items, since the personal characteristics and background questionnaires were distributed at the same time as those questionnaires designed to measure overseas effectiveness.

The problem with collecting predictor data and criteria data at the same time is two-fold. First of all, personal characteristics are subject to change over time in any individual, and an intercultural experience may well bring on unusually rapid changes. The personal characteristics described at the end of the experience by the host parents and sponsoring organization representatives -- and at least to some extent, those described by the students themselves -- may not be the same characteristics they would have described before the student left home. The second problem is that it becomes difficult for the respondents to be objective about the student's personal and background characteristics when they are also asked to rate that student's success in the experience. Hopkins tried to avoid this second problem to some extent by asking respondents to complete the two parts of the questionnaire (dependent and independent variables) on separate days. However, this is a second-best solution, and probably not effective enough. For example, when Hopkins performed multiple regression analysis to determine which predictor variables contribute to "explain" variation in the host fathers' judgements about the success of the students, she found that some 73% of the variation was related to the host father "predictor" variables -- that is, to the host father's description of the student's personal and background characteristics. Correlation was also high between the dependent and independent variables from the host mother's questionnaire, and the same can be said for the questionnaires

from the sponsoring organization's local representatives. It should be noted that these correlations were considerably higher than those for any other combination of independent and dependent variables, which would appear to indicate that the observers in Hopkins' study were unable to separate their observations of the students' personal and background characteristics from their overall impressions of the students' success.

Hopkins' research method, like that of Hawes and Kealey,[3] is primarily statistical. This means that the study should display certain strengths, especially objectivity. It also means that the study is subject to certain limitations. Factor analysis cannot always succeed in identifying meaningful dimensions in the data, as Hopkins' study clearly shows. When factor analysis failed to produce useable scales for Hopkins, she had to rely on rational methods and the findings of the Hawes and Kealey study to construct her own scales. Correlation and multiple regression analyses are also limited in that they can only identify linear relationships between variables. Yet relationships in the "real world" can take a variety of forms.

Hopkins constructed 14 scales from her data to measure overseas effectiveness (the dependent or criteria variables) and 19 scales -- including two scales developed from the Loevinger Sentence Completion Test results -- to measure personal and background characteristics (the independent or predictor variables). Hopkins calculated simple correlations between her two LSCT variables and each of the 14 dependent scales, and used multiple regression analysis to determine which combinations of personal and background (independent) variables might be related to each measure of overseas success. In both of these cases, her correlations were moderate or disappointingly low. In the multiple regression analyses, with the exception of the observer-rated criteria and predictors mentioned earlier in this review, none of Hopkins' analyses can account for even half, and some cannot account for even a quarter of the variation in the dependent variable. Results of this type are typical in quantitative research, however, since one cannot hope to account for all the variation in any dependent variable. What this means is that, although a relationship undoubtedly exists between the variables that are identified in this study, most of the difference between successful and unsuccessful exchange students remains unexplained by the multiple regression model. This may be due either to problems in sample size and data gathering, or to the effect of other variables which have not been identified in this study, or to the inadequacy of the regression model to describe the relationship that does exist.

Hopkins also used extreme group analysis to examine the potential relationships between her variables. She identified the "extreme groups" of highly successful and extremely unsuccessful students according to the ratings on each of her criteria for overseas effectiveness. The results of these extreme group analyses are very interesting because they show that the predictor variables do distinguish between the extreme groups for eight of the criteria of overseas effectiveness, and

for three of these eight, the results of the LSCT were shown to distinguish between the extreme groups.

In addition, Hopkins split the entire sample into two groups. Those who returned home early or who changed host families two or more times were considered to be the "failure" group, and all other students were considered to be the "success" group.[4] For the split groups, six measures of personality or background were shown significantly to distinguish between the "success" and "failure" groups. This time, though, the results of the LSCT did not distinguish between the two groups.

Hopkins' study serves to identify some criteria for overseas effectiveness for high school students and some measures of personal or background characteristics that might relate to these criteria. Hopkins drew on the findings of the CIDA study in the creation of criteria and predictor scales, and by and large her findings are similar to those of the CIDA study. Yet there are indications in Hopkins' work that the CIDA methodology does not suit the exchange student population so well. For example, the respondents did not discriminate among individual questionnaire items as well as the CIDA respondents. For this reason, Hopkins was unable to use factor analysis with any success in the creation of her criteria and predictor scales. Hopkins also encountered problems with the respondents' leaving many questionnaire items blank. This may be another indication that the questions asked were not appropriate or were asked at an inappropriate time for the respondents.

Why should these problems occur for Hopkins when the same questionnaires seemed to work satisfactorily for Hawes and Kealey? One explanation may be that the questionnaire items -- even for the personal characteristics -- were phrased in a way that caused the respondent to select a favorable or an unfavorable rating for each item. An example:

> "When faced with making a decision, this person first cautiously weighs all the factors involved rather than acting with little thought beforehand. To what extent does this statement describe the person you are rating?"[5]

The host parent of a loveable but impulsive exchange student might choose to misrepresent that student when answering the question in the example, so that the student will not "look bad."

The respondents in Hopkins' study were, in fact, quite different from those in the CIDA study. One could make a convincing argument that the exchange students were comparable to the Canadian technical advisors; however, the *observers* in the two studies had very different circumstances. The Canadian technical advisors were rated by their supervisors and by their colleagues. These were not people with whom they lived, but people whom they saw on the job. They were rated by

people who were used to rating them (the supervisors) and by their peers who could compare the subjects with themselves.

The role of the host parent and of the exchange organization representative is considerably different. The host parent might be seen in the same light as a supervisor, yet if this were the case, the student's "job" would be to become a part of the family. The host parents might compare the contribution the exchange student makes to the family with that which their own children make. The "professional" achievements of the student in terms of school work would probably not seem all that important. The exchange organization's representative may or may not know the student very well. In those cases where the representative was not very familiar with the student, school teachers were used as the observers. The biases that these observers might use to rate a student's success or judge his or her personal characteristics are probably somewhat different. It should also be noted that the students were not rated by their peers, as were the Canadian technical advisors.

Given the differences in viewpoint of the Hopkins' study observers and the CIDA study observers, it may be surprising that the studies have such similar findings. To some extent this may be due to the somewhat limited role of observer data in Hopkins' study. Because observers had difficulty discriminating among the different questionnaire items, Hopkins collapsed the observer scales so that each observer had only one rating to measure the student's success, and one predictor rating. This makes it a bit difficult to understand what is meant by the finding, for example, that the host mother predictors are able to distinguish between students whose host country interest is extremely high and those whose host country interest is extremely low.

Hopkins might have tried to find observers for this study whose roles would have been more similar to the CIDA study -- for example, school teachers and fellow classmates or host siblings. Yet Hopkins recognized the importance that a student's success in the host family has for a student exchange organization. A technical advisor's family life is only important to the extent to which it affects his or her ability to perform on the job. It is true that an advisor's family problems can have a big influence on that advisor's job performance, but that case is distinctly different from the need that an exchange student has to be successful in the host family.

Hopkins' dissertation serves to lend support to many logical or traditional ideas about judging the success of high school exchange students and the personal characteristics that might be associated with overseas success. Her most significant contribution is probably the introduction of the Loevinger Sentence Completion Test as a possible predictor of overseas success. More research will be needed, however, before the LSCT and other questionnaires can be used successfully as selection tools for secondary students applying for exchange programs. But the reader who has a general understanding of quantitative

techniques and is willing to take the time needed to study this research will find Hopkins' work to be thought provoking, and will look forward to future research that can build on these findings.

reviewed by Bettina Hansel

Notes

[1]For example: Richard Spencer, "Factors Affecting Successful Performance of Foreign Students: Possible Future Research. A Working Paper." Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, Office of Instructional Resources, Measurement and Research Division, 1967. Also: *The Overseas Selection of Foreign Students*. New York: Education and World Affairs, April 1966. Also: Robert A. Elting, "The Prediction of Freshman Year Academic Performance of Foreign Students from Pre-Admission Data." Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1970.

[2]Hopkins states that the LSCT is the only variable with the potential to be a predictor. The term "predictor" is used for simplicity in this review to refer not only to the LSCT, but also to the personality characteristics and background variables.

[3]Hawes and Kealey also employed some open-ended interview questions with Canadians and host nationals, yet they tended to de-emphasize these findings in favor of the statistical data. In this way, I believe, they underutilized some of their data. The criteria for overseas success gleaned from those interviews were viewed as "opinions . . . representing an ideal," and were compared with the "hard" data, but Hawes and Kealey did not test the validity of these opinions by using them to develop their questionnaires.

[4]These labels have been given for convenience only. It should not be assumed that all students who return home early or who move more than once have somehow "failed" in the experience.

[5]Hopkins, Appendix C, page 271.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS IN INTERCULTURAL LEARNING

is a publication of

AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc.
313 East 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017, USA

Editor: Dr. Neal Grove

Associate Editor: Bettina Hansel

Vice President for Programs:
Dr. Urs-Rainer von Arx

AFS International publishes the **Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning** as a public service, and for this reason the articles contained in the **Papers** are not copyrighted unless a specific notice to the contrary is provided. Articles printed herein without copyright notice may be quoted or reprinted freely and without permission; however, proper attribution should be given and the Editor of the **Papers** should be informed.

Until further notice, each number of the **Papers** is disseminated without charge. Anyone may have his name added to the mailing list by writing to the Editor.

Potential contributors should communicate with the Editor prior to submitting articles to be considered for publication.